

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

MELISSA ANDERSON,

Plaintiff,

-against-

YONKERS CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT;  
CARLOS MORAN,

Defendants.

25-CV-3605 (CS)

ORDER OF SERVICE

CATHY SEIBEL, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff, who is proceeding *pro se*, brings this action under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (“Title VII”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17, and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (“ADA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12112-12117, alleging that her employer discriminated against her based on her race and disability. By order dated May 5, 2025, the Court granted Plaintiff’s request to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”), that is, without prepayment of fees.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

The Court must dismiss an IFP complaint, or any portion of the complaint, that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); *see Livingston v. Adirondack Beverage Co.*, 141 F.3d 434, 437 (2d Cir. 1998). The Court must also dismiss a complaint when the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction of the claims raised. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3)*.

While the law mandates dismissal on any of these grounds, the Court is obliged to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally, *Harris v. Mills*, 572 F.3d 66, 72 (2d Cir. 2009), and interpret them to raise the “strongest [claims] that they suggest,” *Triestman v. Fed. Bureau of Prisons*, 470 F.3d 471, 474 (2d Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted) (emphasis in

original). But the “special solicitude” in *pro se* cases, *id.* at 475 (citation omitted), has its limits – to state a claim, *pro se* pleadings still must comply with Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which requires a complaint to make a short and plain statement showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.

## DISCUSSION

### A. Claims against Carlos Moran

Individuals are not subject to liability under Title VII or the ADA. *See Wrighten v. Glowski*, 232 F.3d 119, 120 (2d Cir. 2000); *see also Tomka v. Seiler Corp.*, 66 F.3d 1295, 1313 (2d Cir. 1995) (“[I]ndividual defendants with supervisory control over a plaintiff may not be held personally liable under Title VII.”), *abrogated on other grounds by Burlington Ind. v. Ellerth*, 524 U.S. 742 (1998); *Darcy v. Lippman*, 356 F. App’x 434, 437 (2d Cir. 2009) (holding that the ADA does not provide for actions against individual supervisors).

Carlos Moran is not a proper defendant under Title VII or the ADA.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, Plaintiff alleges no facts suggesting Moran was personally involved in violating her rights. The Court therefore dismisses Plaintiff’s claims against Moran for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).

---

<sup>1</sup> Claims under city and state human rights laws may be asserted against individuals. *See Feingold v. New York*, 336 F.3d 138, 158-59 (2d Cir. 2004) (holding that individuals are subject to liability under city and state human rights laws). To assert a claim against an individual defendant under city or state human rights laws, “a plaintiff must either show direct, personal involvement in discriminatory conduct, or that the defendant ‘aided and abetted’ the discrimination or retaliation at issue.” *Zambrano-Lamhaouhi v. N.Y. City Bd. of Educ.*, 866 F. Supp. 2d 147, 162-63 (E.D.N.Y. 2011) (citing *Feingold*, 336 F.3d at 157-59). Should Plaintiff wish to do so, she may seek leave to file an amended complaint to assert a claim under the New York State Human Rights Law by naming individual defendants in the caption of the complaint and providing facts showing that they were personally involved in violating her rights.

**B. Order of service**

Because Plaintiff has been granted permission to proceed IFP, she is entitled to rely on the Court and the U.S. Marshals Service to effect service.<sup>2</sup> *Walker v. Schult*, 717 F.3d. 119, 123 n.6 (2d Cir. 2013); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) (“The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process . . . in [IFP] cases.”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3) (the court must order the Marshals Service to serve if the plaintiff is authorized to proceed IFP).

To allow Plaintiff to effect service on Defendant Yonkers City School District through the U.S. Marshals Service, the Clerk of Court is instructed to fill out a U.S. Marshals Service Process Receipt and Return form (“USM-285 form”) for Defendant. The Clerk of Court is further instructed to issue a summons and deliver to the Marshals Service all the paperwork necessary for the Marshals Service to effect service upon Defendant.

If the complaint is not served within 90 days after the date the summons is issued, Plaintiff should request an extension of time for service. *See Meilleur v. Strong*, 682 F.3d 56, 63 (2d Cir. 2012) (holding that it is the plaintiff’s responsibility to request an extension of time for service).

Plaintiff must notify the Court in writing if her address changes, and the Court may dismiss the action if Plaintiff fails to do so.

**CONCLUSION**

The Court dismisses Plaintiff’s claims against Carlos Moran for failure to state a claim. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). Plaintiff may seek leave to file an amended complaint, should she

---

<sup>2</sup>Although Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure generally requires that a summons be served within 90 days of the date the complaint is filed, Plaintiff is proceeding IFP and could not have effected service until the Court reviewed the complaint and ordered that any summonses be issued. The Court therefore extends the time to serve until 90 days after the date any summonses issue.

wish to do so, to assert claims under the New York State Human Rights Law against any individuals, as set forth in this order.

The Clerk of Court is instructed to issue a summons for the Yonkers City School District, complete the USM-285 form with the address for Defendant, and deliver all documents necessary to effect service to the U.S. Marshals Service.

The Clerk of Court is also directed to mail an information package to Plaintiff.

Plaintiff may receive court documents by email by completing a [Consent to Electronic Service form](#).<sup>3</sup>

SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 8, 2025  
White Plains, New York



---

CATHY SEIBEL  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>3</sup> If Plaintiff consents to receive documents by email, Plaintiff will no longer receive court documents by regular mail.

**SERVICE ADDRESS FOR DEFENDANT**

Yonkers City School District  
1 Larkin Center  
Yonkers, New York 10701